

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING  
SPECIAL BOARD for a  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION  
PLAN**

**Minutes  
Meeting of June 14, 2012  
At Village Hall, 85 Main Street**

**Present:** Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice-Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Marie Early, Cathryn Fadde, Anthony Phillips, Michael Reisman

**Absent:** Stephanie Hawkins, Dick Weissbrod

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm.

**Remarks of Chair**

Mike Armstrong said that the State is working on the LWRP contract; Village Clerk Mary Saari is gathering additional documentation for the State. He also reported that Steve Gaba, Village Attorney, will have the underwater boundary work completed as soon as possible, and that he has received no word from the Village Board on their comments on the Comprehensive Plan / LWRS projects.

Armstrong said that Sen. Charles Schumer has expressed support for a Cold Spring to Beacon trail; the group working on this project has requested information on the Comprehensive Plan (which Armstrong provided) for references in their funding applications. Armstrong said that Scenic Hudson will have a groundbreaking ceremony on Saturday morning for their new interpretive park at the West Point Foundry Preserve. Lastly, Armstrong reminded the Special Board members to send in their timesheets although it appears as if enough time has already been spent to meet requirements but the SB needs to show ongoing work.

**Minutes – April 26, 2012 and May 24, 2012**

Anthony Phillips made a motion to approve the April 26, 2012 minutes. The motion was seconded by Karen Doyle and approved unanimously, with 2 abstentions (Anne Impellizzeri and Michael Reisman abstained since they were absent for the April 26 meeting).

Anne Impellizzeri requested amending the May 24 minutes to include the statement that “Armstrong and the Mayor have agreed that the SB letter about projects will be addressed at a workshop at which Impellizzeri and Armstrong will surely be present and any other members of the SB who are interested. No date has yet been set.” Impellizzeri made a motion to approve the May 24 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Michael Reisman and approved unanimously with 3 abstentions

(Armstrong, Doyle and Phillips abstained since they were absent for the May 24 meeting).

Reisman asked if Ray's report on Cupcake Island had been sent to the Village Board. At the May 24 meeting, Ray had voiced an opinion that a marker should not be erected (it would begin to mar the viewshed). Brad Petrie said that he felt that the Boat Club might be willing to take on the responsibility if there was no liability associated with it. Phillips said that there are other submerged items in the area. There was not agreement as to whether a marker should be erected. If it is agreed that it should be done, then the issues of maintenance and liability would need to be addressed and it needs to be reviewed by the appropriate government agencies. A marker on Cupcake Island would be part of the HMP. This could be an item on a community workshop agenda. Armstrong will forward the current available information to the Village Board.

### **Report of Planning Board Liaison**

This topic was deferred to a later meeting since Dick Weissbrod was not in attendance.

### **Update on GreenPlans's work on LWRP**

Armstrong distributed a status update from GreenPlan on their work to date on Inventory and Analysis. He said that GreenPlan had not yet done any work on the 13 Coastal Policies. He also said that GreenPlan has adopted a different format than that which was used for the CP and LWRS. GreenPlan estimates that approximately 20 to 40 additional hours are required for GreenPlan to complete the work on Inventory and Analysis (between \$1,800 to \$3,600). Approximately \$3,677 has already been spent on GreenPlan's work; GreenPlan is aware that there is a current limit on their billing of \$5,000. Armstrong feels that the work on the 13 Coastal Policies will be substantial, potentially more than the work on Inventory and Analysis. There will also be other GreenPlan expenditures, including the implementation Plan, reviews/editing, meeting attendance, etc.

Reisman mentioned that it might be possible that the Special Board could perform some of the work in Inventory and Analysis. Impellizzeri brought up that Doyle's group had done an inventory of vacant and underutilized sites a few years ago. Armstrong said he would go back to GreenPlan and see if there was some work that could be re-used or some work that the SB could do. Marie Early asked if a draft of what they currently have could be obtained; Armstrong said he would follow up on that. Armstrong pointed out that any unused monies from the grant could be used to draft new/updated zoning (which would be included in the LWRP), an activity that GreenPlan is skilled in doing.

### **Harbor Management Plan – Educational Opportunities**

David Hardy (of the Harbor Management Plan (HMP) working group) spoke about waterside educational opportunities. He distributed 2 lists of such opportunities at various locations. Rough water at Dockside makes sculling and sailing questionable at that site; some of the boats are more fragile and might not be well suited to the site. Capacity for these types of crafts would require infrastructure to be built. David said that he had received input from people that they would like to have a learn-to-sail program. Toe-in-water would be of interest at Dockside; the old trailer launch might be a good spot for this since there is no rip rap there, although there are some dangerous features at that spot. There may be some vegetation issues at that spot, and there may be some maintenance issues as well. Reisman said that he does not find that area dangerous. All of the sporting activities would require sponsorship of some sort.

Impellizzeri suggested amplifying these opportunities, using the Dockside section in the LWRS. She asked if the Dockside spot was good for learn-to-sail, or for competitive rowing – is this a good part of the river for those activities because of the strong river currents in the area? David said that sailing could be difficult there, as well as crew boats, but people contend with these problems at other locations on the river, using the river in the morning when it is most calm. Armstrong said that the elaboration of the Dockside report could identify both the pro's and con's. Brad Petrie pointed out that if the community wants these activities, Dockside is the only location for them – and that it be part of the planning in the eventuality that it be possible, that it not be ruled out, that people were open to it. He also pointed out that many of the water activities have similar infrastructure requirements - storage (of equipment and boats), floating dock, moorings – for sail, sculling, BBBB. He said that there are already science classes at the school which use the river and what the teachers would like to have is toe-in-water access and storage for the equipment they use (storage is currently their biggest obstacle). Impellizzeri suggested someone from the original Dockside work group to work with David in extending the Dockside report. David was asked about Teri Barr's previous concern about inexperienced or novice kayaking at Dockside; David agreed that the best place for new or inexperienced kayakers was at Foundry Dock Park. It was pointed out that this level of detail is probably not appropriate for the report.

It was agreed that a practical next step would be to use these suggestions to elaborate or amplify on the Dockside report (in the LWRS)

It was requested that there be a change in wording in the last sentence of the first paragraph from “The property is owned by New York State which has indicated a willingness to lease the property to the Village of Cold Spring.” to “The property is owned by New York State ; efforts are underway to establish an agreement for the Village to maintain the property.”

## **Harbor Management Plan – Recreational Opportunities**

Brad Petrie (of the Harbor Management Plan (HMP)) working group spoke on recreational power and sailboats. He approached the question by asking what facilities does the community have, what does it lack, and what issues are there? The main facility is the Boat Club which has 80 slips that accommodate boats 30 feet and under (there are a few boats larger than that which have special accommodations) because of the type of docks that they have. What is missing is the ability to accommodate boats of larger than 30 feet, both for residents (some residents have expressed interest in obtaining 30 foot or larger boats) and visitors to Cold Spring. The Boat Club is currently at capacity; the Boat Club has increased its capacity over the past few years from 65 boats to 80 boats, by reconfiguring the docks. The question facing the Boat Club is whether there will be a demand for additional capacity, and whether additional reconfiguration can be accomplished to generate more capacity. The Boat Club has been in a stable state for the past 3 or 4 years.

So, how can the Boat Club grow? A mooring field is a possibility; it is less expensive than docks. According to the state, a mooring field of 20 or less moorings is a “minor project” requiring minimal regulatory review. The question would be where to site the mooring field; 3 alternatives have been raised: off Dockside, straight out from the Boat Club, in Foundry Dock Cove area (Brad mentioned that 3 or 4 moorings have recently appeared there). Brad was asked who regulates these moorings? Phillips stated the area there is very shallow; and that there was a mooring field off Dockside a number of years ago; the DeLuccia family had docks there that moored boats 35 foot or larger. The Coast Guard regulates the shipping channel; it doesn’t get involved in less than 5 moorings outside the shipping channel. Brad said that it was his understanding that the Village can establish rules for moorings, buoys, etc., if the Village wishes to do so. The Village has a local law establishing the minimum permissible distance from the docks and/or moorings to the main dock. Brad was asked if additional mooring fields straight out from the Boat Club would impair the ability of commercial boats to dock at the Main Dock; he said that most commercial boats should not have an issue but that it would create an additional obstacle to navigation. A 20 boat mooring field will take up a significant area, especially for larger boats; each boat needs room for a circle (so that the boat can swing around 360 degrees) with a radius 2.5 times the length of the boat. A 40 foot boat requires an 80 to 100 feet radius. He felt that maybe 5 to 10 moorings would be sufficient for the Boat Club; there is not a large demonstrated demand for more than that. More than 20 moorings would require a larger review, public hearing, etc. Brad has been talking with the Chelsea Yacht club who told him that there is minimal maintenance with minimal Coast Guard oversight there. Additional capacity through expansion of the current docking system could probably only be done toward the Main Dock and that raises issues with the viewshed and maintenance; expansion further out into the river would be more difficult because of the depth of the water (using the current docking system) – the riverbed falls off very quickly beyond the current dock perimeter. Which means there is very limited capability of extending the current docking. A different docking system would permit more docking but it is much more expensive and raise environmental issues – mooring fields would be much less expensive and easier. Mooring fields have additional requirements: a means to get from the dock to the moored

boats; moorings must be put in and taken out each year; there is the regulatory issue associated with a mooring field.

The issue of access influences where the mooring field would best be sited. Also, Dockside is very exposed to the wind which is not ideal. Since the Boat Club is the most likely site of embarkation and debarkation for a mooring field, a mooring field at Dockside would have to have any “taxi service” cross boat traffic at the Main Dock which could have increased commercial traffic there. The most likely site for a mooring field seems to be straight out from the Boat Club particularly if it is a small mooring site (5 or less). Foundry Cove is very protected for a mooring field, but it is quite shallow close to shore. In other words, there are issues where ever it goes. So, do we want to create a mooring field, where should it go, and who will take on the responsibility for regulating and maintaining it. Brad believes the Boat Club is ambivalent about taking on this role but, to him, it makes the most sense. Having the Village take the role, including maintenance, may not be feasible. Since the embarkation/debarkation point would probably be the Boat Club, Brad felt that asking the Boat Club take this on is a reasonable plan. A question was asked if there are any issues with property ownership beyond the property which the Boat Club currently occupies? Brad said that he doesn’t know. The LWRs establishes ownership by the Village of Cold Spring west of the shoreline out to 1,500 feet. The underwater boundary research would help answer this question. Brad was asked what the Boat Club would like to do, what it would be willing to undertake; Brad was asked if the Boat Club would declare what it wants to do, what it is willing to do. A point was raised that other municipalities in Putnam County should evaluate uses in areas other than the Village of Cold Spring. Brad estimated that it would cost approximately \$1,500 per mooring; currently, individuals pay for their own moorings although the Boat Club does seasonal maintenance of the moorings. It was suggested that a few moorings could establish the size of the demand. Demand exists now for those members who may wish to acquire boats larger than 30 feet; demand may exist for visitors with larger boats, and this is a community service.

Armstrong asked Brad to document the points that he made, including the tradeoffs, which could then be used as discussion points at a community workshop to build the public’s understanding of what the choices are – should the Village do anything different, should the Boat Club take any actions, etc. Brad said he already had this and he would send it on to the Special Board. Brad was also asked to provide a map showing where a mooring field would be located. The Boat Club docks currently occupy about 400 square feet of space. If a mooring field were to be located to the west of the docks, the mooring field may interfere with navigation from/to the Boat Club. Brad was also asked to identify those items which the Boat Club officially supports, versus those items that the Boat Club might consider or which might be possible, which the Village should consider.

Brad identified two other issues facing the Boat Club. The first is that the bulkhead needs to be replaced. Current estimates are approximately \$100,000 for materials alone. The second is silting at the Boat Club; at some point, dredging will be needed. The Boat Club believes that dredging is beyond their financial ability. Brad was

asked to provide any facts and/or knowledge relative to silting. This information would be very helpful in creating the LWRP. It was suggested that the Army Corps of Engineers may be able to provide data or information on the issue of silting. It was further suggested that the Special Board could provide assistance in getting information from the ACE. It was also stated that dredging was never performed in the areas of the Boat Club or the Main Dock. Brad's opinion was that a 6 inch sea level rise would not affect the Boat Club; a sea level rise of 18 inches would cause flooding. Ice freezing down to the riverbed can pull silt out of the river edge and have a positive effect on silting.

### **Possible additional LWRP Project: Kemble Avenue Access**

This topic was deferred to a later meeting when sufficient time will be available for discussion.

### **Public Comment**

Tom Mullane, a resident of Mountain Avenue, thanked the Special Board for all their work; the person, a high school science teacher who takes his students to the Hudson River, also expressed his interest in high school science education on the Hudson and said he was glad to see that being considered for Dockside; lastly, he offered his opinion that Foundry Dock is the best spot for kayaking - with the parking at the train station, the short distance for transporting his kayak at Foundry Dock, and the shallow water there so that kayaker can get adjusted before getting into deeper water. Another person mentioned that maybe the Boat Club could consider permitting the Boat Club for use by school science groups; it was pointed out that Little Stony Point was ideal for school science groups.

### **Adjournment**

Cathryn Fadde made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Phillips and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

---

Mike Armstrong